

## PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE 20 OF THE INTERNATIONAL RULES OF NOMENCLATURE

CARROLL W. DODGE

*Mycologist to the Missouri Botanical Garden*

*Professor in the Henry Shaw School of Botany of Washington University*

I. It is moved to strike out “-32” in article 20 (f) so that it will read: (f) *Fungi caeteri*, 1821 (Fries, *Systema mycologicum*).

Seymour (Host Index of North American Fungi, ix. 1929) and Ramsbottom (Brit. Myc. Soc. Trans. 18: 314-316. 1934) have called attention to the ambiguity of this section of Article 20 (Article 19 of the Brussels Rules). The writer (Ann. Myc. 27: 157. 1929) has also called attention to this subject as it affects the standing of *Elaphomyces*. Undoubtedly many others have struggled with the same problem.

This emendation will solve or at least simplify most of the difficulties involved and is in line with much current practice. It seems probable that the framers of this section intended this interpretation and that “-32” was added editorially when it was noted that the last part containing the index to the ‘*Systema mycologicum*’ was not published until 1832. Some of those who were very active in framing the rules as they relate to the nomenclature of fungi, including the late W. G. Farlow, always took this view and have largely influenced current practice.

If one takes the alternative interpretation (e. g. Ramsbottom, *l. c.*) that most of the Discomycetes and Tremellaceae begin with 1822 (Fries, *Systema mycologicum*, vol. 2, part 1), etc., one is faced with the difficulty of deciding whether Persoon’s ‘*Mycologia europaea*.’ 1822, was published before or after the work of Fries. Mutatis mutandis, the same problem arises in some of the other parts. On the other hand, if 1821 be taken as the point of departure for all the *Fungi caeteri*, this problem is less acute as the only work to be considered is S. F. Gray’s ‘*Natural Arrangement of British Plants*.’ 1821. Ac-

Issued December 12, 1934.



according to a note left by the late W. G. Farlow, the mycologists active in framing the rules agreed to consider it subsequent to Fries' 'Systema mycologicum.' 1821, as no information was available at the time (and none has been found since) which would settle the question of priority between these two works.

The decade 1821-1831 was very rich in important publications in the field of mycology. In many groups in which Fries was little interested and on which he published nothing subsequent to his treatment in the 'Systema,' the work of this period is superior to that of Fries. If we accept the interpretation that the date when a genus was treated in Fries' 'Systema mycologicum,' is the date of departure for that genus, we have the anomalous situation that part of an author's work is acceptable as valid, while the work on a closely related genus is invalid, although the whole was published in the same book at the same time; e. g., Gray's treatment of *Geoglossum* in 1821 is valid but not his treatment of *Helvella* and other genera of Discomycetes, although he is more modern in his segregation of genera than was Fries, and in practice some of his generic names are in common use although Fries did not recognize them in 1822. By confining the date to 1821 we conserve the Friesian tradition and interpretation for all groups in which he showed a continuing interest and in which he has profoundly influenced mycology, while allowing the works of Gray (Discomycetes), Persoon and Link (Fungi Imperfecti), who worked with better optical equipment and published figures of microscopic detail in some cases, to be taken directly rather than through the interpretation of Fries, who never used a microscope.

It was the intention of the late A. B. Seymour and of the late Roland Thaxter, both of whom had a wide experience in the nomenclature of most groups of fungi over a period of fifty years, to offer this motion to clarify this ambiguity which was evident soon after the publication of the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature in 1912. However, pressure of work prevented its submission in time to be placed upon the agenda at the last Congress in Cambridge, 1930, and they died



some time before the call for motions for the Congress in Amsterdam in 1935.

II. It is moved to insert the following paragraph at the end of Article 20: It is permissible to recognize the Friesian subgenera ("tribus") of *Agaricus* (Fries, Syst. Myc. 1: 1-314. 1821) as genera, citing only Fries as the author of species so long as they are retained in the genus corresponding to the "tribus" in which Fries placed them.

In the decades from 1870 to 1890, Friesian subgenera of *Agaricus* were all raised to generic rank by Quélet, Karsten, and other authors, quite blindly following the Friesian tradition. In most cases, the authors probably were unconscious that they had introduced an innovation. It is almost impossible to determine who first used a name, owing to the rarity of one work and the ephemeral nature of others. Quélet's 'Champignons du Jura et des Vosges' and its first three supplements were published in the very rare 'Mémoires de la Société d'Émulation de Montbéliard,' of which no copy is known to exist in America and the only set known to me containing these volumes is in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris. This work was reprinted, revised, and repaged without clear indication of the dates of issue and is known in only a few of the very large libraries of the world. The other sources for new combinations not made by Quélet, who treats the flora of a very limited region, are scattered through popular mushroom books of the period, often undated or occurring only in later editions in libraries, mostly with unsatisfactory descriptions. Karsten's 'Rysslands, Finlands och den Skandinaviska halföns Hattsvampar' 1: 1-571. 1879, although not maintaining the Friesian tradition, yields other combinations as he dealt with a somewhat different flora. Not until Cuboni & Mancini's compilation in their 'Sylloge Hymenomycetum' 1: 1-1144. 1887 [Saccardo, Syll. Fung. 5] are all the known species of the old genus *Agaricus* referred to their modern subgenera, citing Fries as the author. Since the determination of the date of the combinations produced when the old Friesian subgenera ("tribus") were raised to generic rank involves



bibliographic research out of all proportion to the importance of the matter, almost all authors dealing with Agaricaceae have consistently cited Fries only, although in none of his publications did he formally use the combination attributed to him. In much of the literature before 1870, the generic name *Agaricus* was indicated only by its initial while the subgeneric name is practically always written out in full. Even Fries practically regarded his subgenera as genera, e. g., in the individual parts of the 'Monographia,' we find titles as "Monographia Mycenarum," "Monographia Collybiarum," etc., although in the work itself he still retains the A. before the subgeneric name.

Some may suggest that if this is done, it might be done with equal propriety with segregates from other large Friesian genera such as *Hydnum*, *Polyporus*, *Peziza*, *Sphaeria*, etc. The cases are not altogether parallel. Segregates were not so universally recognized, nor named for the Friesian subgenera so completely. They were usually made in formal proposals by authors who realized what they were doing. They are to be found in relatively common books and periodicals where it is usually possible to determine dates with some degree of accuracy, and they were usually made much earlier.